

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/828,539	04/04/2001		Howard Preissman	361722000201	9912	
21394	7590	11/16/2005		EXAMINER		
		RPORATION	MILLER, CHERYL L			
680 VAQUEROS AVENUE SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-3523			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	•			3738		

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			\sim
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/828,539	PREISSMAN, HO	WARD
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cheryl Miller	3738	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 At 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		e merits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 33-44 and 46-53 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) 33-39 and 46-53 is/are 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 40-44 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	re withdrawn from consideration. r election requirement. r. epted or b) objected to by the lidrawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by the lidrawing(s) is objected to by the lidrawing(s) to be held in abeyance.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:		O-152)

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the claims

A board decision was mailed on August 10, 2005 in which the 103(a) rejections over claims 33-39 and 46-53 were affirmed. These claims have been withdrawn from consideration by the examiner.

The board reversed claims 40-44 and prosecution is being reopened with respect to these claims.

No reply from the applicant has been received and the two-month period for reply has expired.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ersek et al. (US 5,258,028, previously cited). Ersek discloses a flowable matrix (31) and radiopaque particles (30; col.3, lines 7-19; col.10, lines 23-26) having a particle size between 30µ and 3000µ (abstract). Although Ersek discloses a large range of particle sizes (in which the claimed particle sizes fall within) and Ersek further discloses variation of particle size within a group of particles (col.5 line 64-col.6 line 2), Ersek has not disclosed the specific sizes claimed. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a particle size of 350µ for example, which falls within **both** claimed size groupings, or particle

Art Unit: 3738

sizes of less than 350μ combined with particle sizes between 350μ and 2200μ, 570μ and 2200μ, 450μ and 1600μ, or 570μ and 1150μ, since Ersek has disclosed variation of particle sizes within a group of particles and "where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 2354 (CCPA 1955). In addition, because the two claimed particle groups fall between 120μ-2200μ and Ersek discloses use of particles between 30μ and 3000μ, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the specific particle sizes claimed within the range, since "In the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a prima facie case of obviousness exists. In re Wertheim, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl Miller whose telephone number is (571) 272-4755. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (571) 272-4755. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/828,539 Page 4

Art Unit: 3738

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cheryl Miller

CORRINE McDERMOTT SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Queta TC 3700